

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 01-2314

---

Mary P. Loeffler,

Appellant,

v.

Larry G. Massanari,<sup>1</sup> Commissioner of  
Social Security Administration,

Appellee.

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

Appeal from the United States  
District Court for the  
District of Nebraska.

[UNPUBLISHED]

---

Submitted: November 6, 2001  
Filed: November 15, 2001

---

Before WOLLMAN, Chief Judge, BOWMAN, and LOKEN, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Mary P. Loeffler appeals the District Court's<sup>2</sup> order affirming the denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. In conjunction with her June 1997 applications, Loeffler claimed disability since March 1996 because of

---

<sup>1</sup>Larry G. Massanari has been appointed to serve as Acting Commissioner of Social Security and is substituted as appellee pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 43(c)(2).

<sup>2</sup>The Honorable Richard G. Kopf, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Nebraska.

fibromyalgia, depression, and allergies. After a hearing at which a vocational expert testified in response to a hypothetical posed by the administrative law judge (ALJ), the ALJ found that Loeffler could not perform her past relevant work, but she could perform the jobs the vocational expert identified. Having carefully reviewed the record, see Dunahoo v. Apfel, 241 F.3d 1033, 1037 (8th Cir. 2001) (standard of review), we affirm.

We reject Loeffler's apparent challenge to the ALJ's credibility findings. See Hogan v. Apfel, 239 F.3d 958, 962 (8th Cir. 2001) (explaining that deference to ALJ is appropriate when ALJ explicitly discredits claimant and presents reasonable basis for doing so). We conclude that Loeffler's reliance on the statements by her doctors that were related to her workers' compensation claim is misplaced because a disability determination by another agency is not binding on the Social Security Administration, see 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1504, 416.904 (2001), and as the ALJ noted, these physicians' residual functional capacity findings were consistent with those of the ALJ. Moreover, the record belies Loeffler's assertions about her inability to afford treatment. We decline to address Loeffler's remaining arguments. See PlaNNet Prods., Inc. v. Shank, 119 F.3d 729, 732 (8th Cir. 1997) (declining to consider argument raised for first time in reply brief); Misner v. Chater, 79 F.3d 745, 746 (8th Cir. 1996) (refusing to consider argument not raised in district court).

Loeffler's tendered supplemental brief is accepted for filing.

The order of the District Court is affirmed. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.